

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

**WILLIE ROMEL McKNIGHT ,** §  
**#784060,** §  
Plaintiff, §  
§  
§  
§  
v. § 3:04-CV-1930-R  
§  
§  
§  
§  
**DOUGLAS DRETKE, DIRECTOR,** §  
**TDCJ-CID,** §  
§  
§  
§  
Defendant. §

**O R D E R**

Before the Court is **Petitioner's Motion for Extension of Time to File Response** (Dkt. No. 14), almost twice the duration of the thirteen days allotted to Petitioner to file objections to Magistrate Judge Stickney's Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation on his petition for writ of habeas corpus (filed June 20, 2006) (Dkt. No. 13). Although the Court affords Petitioner a certain measure of leniency as he proceeds *pro se*, *see Spotville v. Cain*, 149 F.3d 374, 377 (5th Cir. 1998) (per curiam), it cannot grant additional time on a deadline that has already passed.

Even if the Court did grant Petitioner's motion, his effort would be fruitless. After conducting a review of the pleadings, files and records in this case, the Findings and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court finds that the Findings and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge are correct and they are hereby accepted as the Findings of the Court.

It is ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that:

1. Petitioner's Motion is DENIED.
2. Defendants petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 is DENIED.

3. The Clerk shall transmit a true copy of this Judgment and the Order Accepting the Findings and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge to Petitioner.

SO ORDERED this 25th day of July, 2006.



---

JERRY BUCHMEYER  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE